

Protagoras argues for the central importance of knowledge and wisdom in a good life, the *Symposium* suggests that the mere *desire* for wisdom can secure virtue and happiness.

St Catharine's College, Cambridge

ALEX LONG
al241@hermes.cam.ac.uk

ARCHYTAS OF TARENTUM

HUFFMAN (C.A.) *Archytas of Tarentum. Pythagorean, Philosopher and Mathematician King*. Pp. xvi + 665. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. Cased, £95, US\$175. ISBN: 0-521-83746-4.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X06001594

This is the first major monograph devoted to the Pythagorean mathematician, military leader of Tarentum and acquaintance of Plato, Archytas. C.A. Huffman, to whom we already owe an important monograph on an earlier Pythagorean, Philolaus of Croton (Cambridge, 1993), supplies us here with an indispensable work of reference for anyone concerned with Archytas, with Pythagoreanism or with the history of mathematics in the time of Plato. In it the reader will find a complete collection (Parts 2 and 3) of the evidence concerning Archytas (the Greek and Latin sources are printed and accompanied by English translations and extensive analysis), as well as a discussion (in Appendix 1) of spurious material and a long preliminary section (Part 1) which surveys the 'life, writings and reception' of Archytas and his philosophy and mathematics. Throughout, H. provides very careful and full discussion of the many problems surrounding Archytas and takes position with respect to earlier scholarship.

The evidence concerning Archytas which H. considers as genuine is divided into two groups: the 'genuine fragments' (Part 2) and the 'genuine testimonia' (Part 3). H. prints the text given in the best available editions, with the notable exception of passages from Porphyry's commentary on Ptolemy's *Harmonics*, for which he provides manuscript collations and a new text. As genuine fragments H. accepts those printed as such by Diels-Kranz. However, he indicates that these fragments (i.e. quotations purporting to be from a work by Archytas) are not all equally convincing (p. 226). The problem of authenticity in the case of Archytas is largely caused by the existence of many passages going under his name which are certainly spurious: how then are we to discern what might be genuine? H. discusses various criteria that may be used (pp. 97–9), for example the presence of technical mathematics, and applies them in his analysis. One factor in the puzzle is the question *why* Archytas was of interest to certain ancient authors. The main sources for the fragments identified by H. as genuine are Porphyry, Iamblichus, Nicomachus (a crucial predecessor for Iamblichus in his Pythagorising programme) and Stobaeus. Stobaeus' anthology seems to have some relation to schools founded by Iamblichus and his pupils (see R. Piccione, in *Philosophie antique* 2 [2002], 169–97) and it is not unlikely that his excerpts from (pseudo-) Pythagorean texts might go back to Iamblichus' activities in collecting and propagating 'Pythagorean' materials. Nicomachus had already begun what Iamblichus was to do on a much larger scale, and may be (in one of his lost works) the source of material quoted by Porphyry. In view of this *Rezeptionsgeschichte* of the 'genuine' fragments, I feel a little less confident about the authenticity of frr. 3 and 4 (Iamblichus → Stobaeus), than about that of frr. 1 and 2.

(quoted by Porphyry, but containing technical matters). As for the ‘genuine testimonia’, H. points out that in a number of cases we are here on fairly solid ground, since many of these go back to the work of Aristotle and of his pupils Aristoxenus and Eudemos, and we may presume that they are well-informed about Plato’s Pythagorean contemporary, however much they interpret this information in their reports.

In Part 1, H. brings together the results of his analysis of the evidence concerning Archytas. In an interesting account of his life, H. suggests that he may have studied with Philolaus and may have had Eudoxus as a pupil (p. 7). The question of Plato’s contacts with Archytas is also discussed with care, and H. suggests that Plato is critical of him in *Republic* 7 (cf. pp. 57, 64). H. presents Archytas as more Aristotelian than Platonic in his philosophical approach and thinks that (like Aristotle) Archytas is concerned with individual concrete objects in relation to which science should distinguish ‘universal concepts’ (cf. p. 59). This interpretation of Archytas is already suggested by H.’s translation of the beginning of fr. 1 (p. 105: ‘individual things’ for *ἐκάστου*), a translation which I feel should be more neutral. H.’s Archytas consequently tends to be put on the Aristotelian side of a contrast with Plato, a contrast between the science of sensible particulars and that of the ‘intelligible world’ (cf. pp. 64–6). H.’s translation of *ἐναργεστέρῳ* in fr. 4 (‘concretely’; cf. p. 237) tends to lead in the same interpretative direction. I also feel that H.’s attempt to give continuity to fr. 3 by adding a word (line 5: <λογίζεσθαι> *ζητεῖν ἀδύνατον*) so as to join the thought in the two bits in Stobaeus may be pushing Stobaeus’ evidence, as excerpts, too hard. Indeed H. sometimes prefers an interpretation that gives the evidence more weight than a sceptical reader will think it can bear. Such a reader may not then completely follow H. in concluding that Archytas’ work in the mathematical sciences, for example his solution to the problem of the duplication of the cube in geometry and his theory of means in harmonics, ‘was both based on and radically transformed an all-encompassing view of the cosmos and the place of humanity in it, which he inherited from his predecessor Philolaus’ (p. 46). But all readers of this beautifully produced book will greatly benefit from the wealth of documents, information and detailed analysis which it offers.

Université de Fribourg (Switzerland)

DOMINIC J. O’MEARA
dominic.omeara@unifr.ch

XENOPHON

TUPLIN (C.J.) (ed.) *Xenophon and his World*. (*Historia Einzelschriften* 172.) Pp. 524, maps, pls. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2004. Cased, €84. ISBN: 3-515-08392-8.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X06001605

This volume contains 24 of 56 papers in the original programme of the 1999 ‘World of Xenophon’ conference organised by Christopher Tuplin and Graham Oliver. The conference, which I attended, was wonderful indeed and an opportunity for the scattered scholars who work on Xenophon to gather, meet one another and share new research. This volume is both a reminder of a good time and an indication of its success.

Participants were invited to tackle anything related to Xenophon. Since he wrote in so many different genres, scholars responded to the invitation in very different ways.

The Classical Review vol. 56 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2006; all rights reserved